P.F. 66 of 97.

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1890-91

File No. 75 of 90

191 .

Serial Nos. ~~1-36~~
1-8

(L.R.)

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. ~~1-36~~ 1-8.

major ~~Part~~ B for ~~January 1902.~~ August 1891

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Subbaramaih Shaunbhog of Hemagara Village, Anekal Taluk.

W D 1250—GPB—30,000—28-1-19

Condemned pr RO

No 1262 of 28 Aug 1890

Mr
Subbaramiah
Shanbhog of
Hannagakeri
Anekal Taluq
Bangalore Dt.

Respt
Dreshnatha

Decision
His father
is alive
when the order
was passed
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible] 1891
Sd
9/2/91

~~Petitioner's~~ appt's father Ramaswami was the Shanbhog of the two villages viz

(1) Hedagere — ~~1~~165
(2) Hannagakeri. — 879

Ramaswami was allowed to do the duties of village no 1, & one Narasimha appointed as his gumasta for no 2. The latter was removed from his office as he did not do his work properly & the ~~pet's~~ appt's father was asked in 1867 to name another gumasta. He having failed to name ~~another gumasta~~ one, the Respdt, formerly a Huckdar, was appointed as a gumasta. — ~~Pet~~ Appt was appointed in the place of his father ~~who~~ as he was unable to perform the duties. — ~~Pet's~~ Appt ~~contention~~ states that he is able to perform the work of both the villages.

Appt requests that he may be allowed to do so, or to nominate his own gumasta to do the work.

The Dy. Comr states that these villages are at a distance of 7 miles from each other & that one man cannot perform the duties of both.

Under these circumstances, appt ~~Petitioner~~ cannot be allowed to have charge of both the villages. ~~Manas~~ As regards ~~Petitioner's~~ his request that he may allowed to nominate his own Gumasta, the Govr observe that Respt who is a Huckdar entered into an agreement with ~~Petitioner~~ appt's father to pay him half the Potagi allowance & has been paying it accordingly. There is no therefore no valid reason for disturbing the existing arrangement. The appeal is rejected.

10/8/9

Read

Petitioner is informed that he cannot be allowed to have charge of both the villages.

There is also no reason for disturbing the existing arrangement for the performance of the work as from enquiry it appears that Respt has been paying the appt a share in the Potagi allowance according to the arrangement entered into with his father. ~~Petitioner cannot be allowed to have charge of the two villages at the same time~~

The appeal is rejected

Offl memo

With reference to his docket dated 8 Jany 1891 No 696, & the Proceedings therewith forwarded, the Dy Commr of Bangalore is requested to state whether in his opinion the Pl. Subbaramaiah will be able to conduct the work of his office for both the villages of Hennagarekann, & Bidarkare, what the Revenue of each of the villages is, & at what distance they are situated from each other.—

The vernacular Pro are herewith returned, to be re-transmitted with the Dy Commrs reply.

25/1

Vd
24/1/91

(1)

(General Serial No. 32.)
189 0.

No. 1262

Name of Petitioner. Subba Rāmiaha Son of Ramaswamy.

Village. Hennagera Khan

Taluk. Ani[illegible]kul

District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi. 28 - 8 - 90

Date of Receipt. 28 - 8 - 90

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. three

Petition properly stamped
Appeal is within time
Copy of the order appealed
against is produced.
Cl: 1 Rule 1. of addl. Rules.
Submitted to the Council

22/9/90.

L.R. 75-90-1

Case for
Pr.
[illegible]
22/11/90

ABSTRACT.

Appeals against the order of the Deputy Commissioner regarding the Shanboguee of Hennageri Khan

The Shanboguee of Hennageri Khan is hereditary and was held by the petitioner's father and grandfather for a long time.

The Amildar finding Nunjundiaha the Shanbogue's gumasta not keeping proper accounts ordered the petitioner's father to appoint an[illegible] in the place of Nunjundiaha. The petitioner's ~~father~~ suggested his son (Petr) to the post of the Gumasta.

The Taluk authorities with

the intention of appointing one
Hinika Krishnappa recommended
him to the District.

In a similar case in Doddaballapur
Taluk the Dewan has ruled that
no gumasta should be appointed
without the consent of the Registerda
The petitioner's father represented his son
(the petitioner) before the Amildar
and said that his son will perform
the duties.

The petitioner's representation
was not ~~forwarded~~ reported to the District
The Taluk authorities recommended
again Hinika Krishnappa.

The Petitioner's father's petition
stating that the Shanboguee may
be registered in the petitioner's
name and ~~the~~ his agreeing to do
the duties was referred to the Taluk
The Taluk authorities with the
intention of carrying out their
proposal falsely represented that
the Shanboguee may be registered
in the petitioner's name and
the duties to be performed by
Hinika Krishnappa as gumasta
alleging that the petitioner had
to perform the duties of Bitherkere
and other villages.
The District authorities agreeing with the Taluk
have issued an order in No 118
d/ 16-5-87 ~~stating~~ directing that the
Shanboguee should ~~to~~ be registered
in the petitioner's name and the
duties to be performed by
Hinika Krishnappa.

On a subsequent representation of the petitioner and his father the then Amildar ordered that he would consider the case after the outstandings are collected and the accounts are brought under regular order. The petitioner settled every thing and received a certificate from the Amildar on 1st Sept 89 stating that he is capable of discharging the duties.

The Amildar has ordered that he would report the case for sanction to the District on his (Petitioner's) father's petition of 17th August 89. The Amildar was transferred.

The petitioner, on hearing, that the District authorities has issued an order in No 244 of 15th January 90 that only the Registerdars' should do the duties and that gumastas should not be allowed to ~~do~~ the same, again applied to the District on 6-8-90 that he may be allowed to do his duties without a gumasta He received an Endorsement stating that Krishnappa should perform the duties as decided before alleging that there is a great distance between the Khan & Betherkere.

The distance is only 5 miles and the petitioner's father & grandfather has performed the duties before and the petitioner is eligible to do the work of 10 or 12 villages.

Prays that he may be allowed to do his work himself

Endorsement No 60 of 6th August 90 from the Deputy Commissioner.

As there is a great distance between Hennigere Khan & Betherkere and as your father has failed to appoint a gumasta and as the case has been disposed of in 1887 deciding that Krishnappa should perform the duties as a gumasta in Khan there is no reason to interfere again.

ONE RUPEE [illegible] ONE RUPEE [illegible]

28-8-40

14

No 1262

2818

21

[illegible]

I [illegible]

II [illegible]

III [illegible]

IV [illegible]

V [illegible]

VI [illegible] 15 [illegible]

VII [illegible]

VIII [illegible] 16-5-87 [illegible] 11 [illegible]

IX [illegible] 1-9 [illegible]

X [illegible] 17-8-89 [illegible]

XI [illegible] 15-1-90 [illegible] 244 [illegible] 6-8-90 [illegible]

21

[illegible]

XII [illegible] 5 [illegible]

[illegible] 2 [illegible]

[illegible]

10-12 [illegible]

[illegible] 5-

[illegible] 15-20 [illegible] 10-12 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 1000 [illegible]

[illegible] 500 [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] 40/877 [illegible]

[illegible] 6-8-9 [illegible]

[illegible]

3 [illegible]

17

No: 7$\overset{N}{3}$3 (2) [illegible] 8/12/90

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

L.R. 75-90-2

The accompanying Petition No. 1262 dated 28th August/90 received at the Dewan's Office from Subba Ramiah Son of Ramaswamy of Hennagara of the Anekal Taluk

is forwarded, together with its three enclosures, to the Dy. Commissioner Bangalore District, for submission of Proceedings with a precis thereof.

Draft as per Councillor's order

BANGALORE, 29th Novr. 1890.

8/12/90.

By Order,

For Chief Secretary

P. 107.

1260/690

(3)

(General Serial No. 30.)

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
9334
15 JAN. 91
91-622

189

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To The Chief Secretary
to the Dewan of Mysore

Dated 13th January 1891.
Despatched
Received

Enclosures No. 1 & Ver: Papers

General No.
No. 696.

His official Memo
No. 733 dated 8th Ultimo.

As called for in the above, has the honor to submit herewith, the Vernacular proceedings and an English memo connected with the complaint of Subba Ramiah son of Ramaswami of Hennagarakane, Anekal Taluk.

2. The three enclosures are, herewith, returned.

Offg Dy Commissioner

L.R. 75-90-3

Hearing
2d July 1891
Give notice to Pt.
& Krishnappa
ad
27/5/91

Petition Dept
as
12/1/91

Submitted to the Council
17th Jan/90 AR

adjourned to
9th July
1891
as
6/7/91

30
16-1-91

19 3/a

Memo:

Vide Paper marked. 5.

The Village of Hennagarakáné in the Anekal Taluk had formerly two Shanbogues one for Nagadiyat and the other for Bataye.

2. At the time of the abolition of the system of Bataye, one Ramaswami, Shanbogue of Bidargere, was also the Nagadiyat Shanbogue of Hennagarakáné and one Krishnappa the Bataye Shanbogue. The work of two villages having been found heavy for Ramaswami, the Registerdar, one Nunjundia was appointed as his Gumasta to do the work of Hennagarakáné, Ramaswami

himself

himself doing the work of Bidargere. Owing to his defective sight and the consequent laxity in the discharge of Government work, his son Subbaramiah was made Shanbogue of Bidargere.

Vide Papers marked 4, 5, 8 and $\frac{10}{2}$.

3. Since the appointment of Nanjundiah as the Shanbogue Gumasta of Hemmagarakáné, he appears to have conducted the work very carelessly and most discreditably. He was in consequence removed from the Gumastaship and Ramaswami, the registered Shanbogue, was asked to appoint another. But instead of doing so, he recommended his son Subbaramiah

Vide paper marked $\frac{10}{2}$, 11 and 13.

ramiah who was already the Shanbogue of Bidargere also, for the Shanbogi of Hemmagar Kané.

— Do — 12 and 13.

4. Subbaramiah his son and the present petitioner also presented petitions to the same effect.

— Do — 1, 2, 5, 9, 18 and 16.

5. In the meantime, Krishnappah the former Bataye Shanbogue of the village, asserted his claims in his petitions addressed both to the Amildar and the Deputy Commissioner and prayed that he should be appointed Shanbogue of Hemmagar Kané.

$\frac{10}{2}$ and $\frac{10}{4}$

6. The Amildar after enquiring the mutual claims of Subba-Ramiah and Krishnappa, recommended the latter for the office of Shanbogi Gumasta.

As

As the Shanbogue of Bidargere, Subbaramiah had already enough of work and was moreover living at some distance from Hemmagarakáné and his father was incapable of doing any work on account of his defective sight.

The latter was therefore given the option of appointing another as his Gumasta; but as he failed to do so, Major Macintire appointed Krishnappa who possessed better claims than an outsider, and who lived nearer than Subbaramiah the petitioner, as the Shanbogue Gumasta of Hemmagara Kane

Vide paper marked $\frac{17}{2}$.

registering

23

registering the huk in the name of the petitioner himself.

Bangalore
8th January/91

Sd/ [illegible]

Offg Deputy Commissioner.

No. 12421/445

6/10-2-91

1 0 25-90-4

Official Memo:

With reference to his do. dated 8th January 1891, No. 64 and the Proceedings therewith forwarded, the Dy: Commr of Bangalore is requested to state whether, in his opinion, the Petr Subbaramayya will be able to conduct the work of his office for both the villages of Hennagarekanu and Bidarkare, what the Revenue of each of the villages is, and at what distances they are situated from each other.

The ver: procs are herewith returned, to be re-transmitted with the Dy: Commr's reply.

By order

Under Secty.

W.

A.R.

To The Dy: Commr, Bangalore Dt.

6/2

33

(4)

To
The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore Dist

6th February 1891

No. 12421/495 P. 980

Requesting to state whether Petitioner Subbaramayya will be able to conduct the work of the office for Hennagerallam & Bidar Kere villages, what the revenue, & the distances from each other, of these 2 villages.

From the same no 40 d 16.

26

(General Serial No. 31) (57)

OFFICE OF THE DEWAN OF MYSORE
489
20 APR 91
27.5.

189/

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan
of Mysore.

Dated 16th April 1891.

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. 1 file

Rahiman
27/8/91

General No.
D No. 40.

To the same No. 6501/B.90 d/ 15/27 May/91

Submitting further information in connection with petition of Subramayah of Hennagara Kaval Anekal Taluk.

Submitted to the Council.
25th April/91 ACP

L.R. 75-90-5

Returned to file
AS
28/4/91

The council [illegible]
duties of the V-
7 miles [illegible];

27

D. No. 40

Enclo: 1 file

Dy Commissioners Office
Bangalore District.
Dated 16th April 1891.

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Bangalore District.

To

The Chief Secretary to the
Dewan of Mysore.

Sir,

Referring to your Official Memorandum No. 12421/495 dated 10th February 1891, I have the honor to furnish the particulars of Revenue &ca, as per margin, of the villages alluded to, and to state ~~that~~ the Amildar reports that Shanbogue Subramiyah is not capable of looking after the work of both the villages, and to suggest ~~that~~ a separate Shanbogue may be appointed for each village. Considering the distance and the largeness of the

Bidarkere - Revenue Rs: 1164-10-1.
Hanagarkane - " Rs: 878-11-11
Distance from each other about 7 miles.

of the villages, I agree with the Amildar.

2. The file of vernacular papers together with the subsequent correspondence is, herewith, resubmitted for reference and return.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your Most Obedient Servant

Offg Dy. Commissioner

Applt. No. 1262

Subbaramayya Shanbogue
of Hennagir Kane
Anekal Taluk.

Vs (6)

Respdt.
Krishnappa.

Endorsement. D/10/8/91.

L.R. 95-90-6

In reply to his Petition dated 28th August 1890 Petitioner is informed that he cannot be allowed to have charge of both the villages. There is also no reason for disturbing the existing arrangement for the performance ~~is informed that~~ of the work, as from enquiry it appears that Respdt. has been paying the appellant a share in the Potgi allowance according to the arrangement entered into with his father. The appeal is rejected.

2. The enclos: are herewith returned.

15/8

Mysore Dewan's Office,
Petition Department,
August 1891.

By Order,

for Chief ~~Secretary.~~

Noted

(General Serial No. 30).

1891/92

From The Chief Secretary to the Dewan of Mysore

To The Deputy Commissioner Bangalore District.

L. R. 75-90-7

To the same No. 4193 222, 11-2 3/92

Dated 15 }
Despatched 27 } August 1891
Received }

Enclosures No. V. Pro:

General No. 6301 R.
P No. 90

Disallowing Appellant Subbaramiah, Shanbogue of Hemmagirkane, Anekal Taluk, to have charge of both the villages of Bidagere and Hemmagirkane, and to nominate his own gumasta for the latter village.

Before the Government of *His Highness* the Maharaja of Mysore.

Appeal No. 1262 of 20th August 1890.

Appellant.	Vs.	Respondent.
Subbaramayya, Shanbogue of Hennagirkane, Anekal Taluq, Bangalore District.		Krishnappa.

L.R. 75-90-8

Decision. Dated 10th August 1891.

Appellant's father Ramaswami was the shanbogue of the two villages.

(1) Bidagire Beriz 1165

(2) Hennagirkane—874.

Ramaswami was allowed to do the duties of village No. (1) and one Nanjundayya appointed as his gumasta for No. (2). The latter was removed from his office as he did not do his work properly, and the appellant's father was asked in 1887 to name another gumasta. He having failed to name one, the Respondent, formerly a thukkdar, was appointed as a gumasta. Appellant was appointed in the place of his father as he was unable to perform the duties. Appellant states that he is able to perform

the

the work of both the villages and requests that he may be allowed to do so, or to nominate his own gumasta to do the work. The Deputy Commissioner states that the villages are at a distance of 7 miles from each other and that one man cannot perform the duties of both.

Under these circumstances, appellant cannot be allowed to have charge of both the villages. As regards his request that he may be allowed to nominate his own gumasta, the Government observe that Respondent, who is a hukdar, entered into an agreement with appellant's father to pay him half the Poligi allowance and has been paying it accordingly. There is therefore no valid reason for disturbing the existing arrangement. The appeal is rejected.

"By order"

No. 6301
P. 90 27/8/91

for Chief Secretary.

Copy forwarded to the Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore District, with the Vernacular Proceedings received with his No. 40 dated 16th April 1891.

"By order"

for Chief Secretary